

<b>D – 70% CO2 Reduction – Wind</b>	Targets a 70% CO2 reduction by 2035 with additional wind
<b>E – 70% CO2 Reduction – SMR</b>	Targets a 70% CO2 reduction by 2035 with additional small modular nuclear reactors
<b>F – No New Natural Gas</b>	Targets a 70% CO2 reduction by 2035 with no new natural gas capacity

*Table 2 - Duke Portfolios*

Each of the portfolios added substantial solar and natural gas capacity between 2020 and 2035. The amount of storage, wind, and offshore wind (“OSW”) varied by portfolio. Table 3 below shows the original portfolio capacity additions for wind, OSW, storage, and natural gas and the total cumulative solar capacity by 2035 for the combined DEC and DEP regions.

<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Solar</b>	<b>Wind</b>	<b>OSW</b>	<b>Storage</b>	<b>NG</b>
<b>A</b>	8,650	0	0	1,050	9,600
<b>B</b>	12,300	750	0	2,200	7,350
<b>C</b>	12,400	1,350	0	2,200	9,600
<b>D</b>	16,250	2,850	2,650	4,400	6,400
<b>E</b>	16,250	2,850	250	4,400	6,100
<b>F</b>	16,400	3,150	2,650	7,400	0

*Table 3 - Duke Original Portfolio Capacity Additions (MW)*

In its Modified IRP, Duke reanalyzed the six portfolios. It created two variations of the portfolios A through C (e.g., A1 and A2) that differentiated between the original and modified portfolio results. The “1” portfolios retained Duke’s original, rejected natural gas price forecast

and battery cost assumptions, while the “2” portfolios utilized the Commission-directed updates for these values. All remodeled portfolios incorporated other required changes such as the increase in annual interconnection capacity, the extension of the ITC, and the shift to 100% tracking systems for solar.<sup>7</sup> Duke produced nine modified portfolios in its Modified IRP: A1, B1, C1, D1, E1, and F1, and A2, B2, and C2. It did not produce a “2” version of the deep decarbonization portfolios D, E, and F. Table 4 below shows the updated capacity additions for wind, OSW, storage, and natural gas and the total cumulative solar capacity for each of the modified portfolios through 2035.

<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Solar</b>	<b>Wind</b>	<b>OSW</b>	<b>Storage</b>	<b>NG</b>
<b>A1</b>	10,500	0	0	600	8,850
<b>A2</b>	10,350	0	0	1,600	7,950
<b>B1</b>	15,100	1,500	0	1,900	7,500
<b>B2</b>	15,600	1,500	0	3,400	6,100
<b>C1</b>	15,550	1,350	0	2,000	9,600
<b>C2</b>	15,600	1,500	0	3,400	8,250
<b>D1</b>	18,350	2,850	2,650	4,350	6,400
<b>E1</b>	18,350	2,850	250	4,350	6,100
<b>F1</b>	18,350	2,850	2,650	7,350	0

*Table 4 - Modified Portfolio Capacity Additions (MW)*

One important point to note is that correcting Duke’s prior assumptions related to extending the federal ITC, modeling 100% tracking systems, and including a PPA resource option, made solar resources more cost-effective than in Duke’s original modeling. Similarly, the

---

<sup>7</sup> DEC Modified IRP at 8.